

THE
CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1824.

No. 6.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

MAN A FREE, MORAL, AND ACCOUNTABLE AGENT.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, in the beginning of the 6th chapter of that epistle, says, "Leaving therefore the first principles of the oracles of God, let us go on unto perfection." There are then first principles of the oracles of God. These are fundamental truths, which ought to be well understood and firmly established in our minds, to guard us against falling into error in subordinate questions of doctrine and duty.

That man is a free and moral agent, and accountable to God for all that he does, is one of these first principles. This must be understood and held as incontrovertible. If this be rejected, nothing of any value can be retained. If this be not fixed in our minds, as a certain principle, it is not to be expected that a conviction of our utter sinfulness, and of the absolute necessity of our being saved with the salvation of the gospel, will have any deep hold of our feelings.—We shall rather treat as idle tales all the denunciations of the Bible,

and all the expostulations of the preacher.

Scarce any subject has more engaged the enquiries, or divided the opinions of logicians and metaphysicians than this. Elaborate treatises have been published, and from the hands of men of the first order for intellectual talent, and careful research. Yet it is to be doubted, whether the subject has been cleared of all difficulties. Perplexities still exist in the minds of many, and objections continue to be urged. Whether any thing can be added to disembarass the subject is perhaps problematical. If there can, it is apprehended, it must be by beginning precisely at the proper point of enquiry, and by removing from the discussion all irrelevant considerations.

The enquiry, it is conceived, does not properly respect the will of man or any other property of his nature, abstractly considered. This has indeed been rather the subject of controversy. And the celebrated first Edwards of our country has written an ingenious, and if we may judge from the en-

tire failure of the attempts which have hitherto been made to invalidate his reasoning, an unanswerable treatise on this very question, whether the will of man be free. But strictly speaking, neither freedom nor the opposite appears to be predicable of the will abstractly considered, or as an attribute of the man.

If the term *will* be taken for the *faculty* of choosing and refusing, a sense in which it is perhaps most commonly used, there will be a serious difficulty in ascertaining the nature of this faculty. Such a faculty is indeed implied in the known fact that we choose. But we know no more of it as a faculty, and in regard to its specific nature, than we do of that of thinking, feeling, enjoying and suffering. If we predicate liberty or the opposite of this faculty, then no conceivable idea will be expressed by the terms we use.

If the term *will* be taken for that spontaneous election of which we are conscious, when we choose or refuse, then it expresses an act of the agent, not a power of acting. But it is impossible, in the nature of things, that voluntary action should be coerced in a sense the opposite of moral liberty.

The enquiry properly is, whether *man* personally considered in possession of all his faculties, is a free agent. The will is not the agent. It is not the will, abstractly considered, that is under law and accountable, that is to be justified or condemned. It is the

man who thinks, feels and acts.—

The question then is, Is man a free and moral agent? Or, to state the matter perhaps more correctly—Does he act? Does he act freely? Does he act morally?

1. Does he act? What must be meant in this case by acting? To get rid of obligation, blame, and accountability, men have often treated acting as mere motion.—But there is an essential difference between action, and mere motion. Action belongs to mind; motion, to matter. Motion is a mere relative change, of which any thing, whether animate or inanimate, is a subject, comprehending neither intelligence, choice, nor motive. It is an involuntary effect which is brought to pass by some extraneous cause. Thus the wheels of a watch move involuntarily, without thought or motive, by the elastic power of the spring. And the waters of the ocean move by the power of the winds.

It is true, we sometimes use the word act with respect to these secondary causes of motion. We say that heat acts upon water when evaporation is produced.—But the word, in this application of it, is used in a figurative sense. There is some resemblance to our senses between what appears of mere motion and voluntary action. And the word which properly expresses the one, by a natural transition, passes metaphorically to express the other.

Action, in the proper sense of the term, can be predicated of

those beings, only who think, who have an object in view, and who cannot only be capable of choosing, but do in fact, choose.

We are all perfectly acquainted with action in this proper sense of the term. Our fellow-men are perpetually acting before our eyes. We see them in the pursuit of their various objects, and bringing effects to pass. We have full evidence that they have these objects, and the reasons for pursuing them before their minds; and therefore that they pursue them by choice or voluntarily. We reason with them. We endeavour to persuade them to desist from what they are doing, or to do something which we wish to have them do. This, if we had any serious question whether they are properly active beings, would be preposterous.

We are conscious, that we ourselves are intelligent; that we have certain objects of our thought before us, that we do choose or refuse one or more of these objects. And if they are desirable, and in our view attainable, we pursue them overtly, sometimes with great eagerness and industry. In short, we have full as much evidence that we act, as that any inanimate substances move. Nor can we conceive that any intelligent creatures should, in the possession of any power whatever, or by any circumstance, be more properly active than men are. If an angel were to become incarnate, and to act in our view with the

superior powers which we suppose him to possess, whatever effects he might bring to pass, we cannot conceive that any thing would appear, which would manifest him to be an active being beyond what appears with respect to ourselves. We discern nothing in our Lord Jesus Christ, either in respect to his humanity or his divinity, which proved his activity any more than our own activity is proved to ourselves and others, by what we in fact do. One active being may have powers superior to another, and, in the application of those powers, bring to pass what the other cannot.— But this will add nothing to the proof of his activity. Even, if we were perfectly independent of God as he is of us, we cannot conceive how that should make us more active beings, than we now are. It ought to be observed here that our actions have their seat and spring in the internal principles of our nature, in the will and affections, which we sometimes denominate the *heart*. They may be internal only, and not become manifest in their open expressions, so as to become subject to the observation of others. Thus a man may hate his neighbor, and form the resolution to murder him, whenever a favorable opportunity shall occur. This resolution remains with him for months. It does not appear in the actual killing of his neighbor, because the opportunity has not occurred. His purpose is known to

God and himself only. By the laws of civil society, he has not acted in this matter, and is innocent. In the sight of God, and according to his law, he acts and is guilty as really as if the killing had taken place. We are expressly told that he who hateth his brother is a murderer. And it is with an evil heart of unbelief that a man departs from the living God.

When the internal act appears in its outward expressions, by the use made of the bodily organs, or in the effect produced, we denominate it executive or overt. Then it comes out to the notice of others. This is a mere circumstance however, and is not essential to action. This distinction does not imply, as some seem to have conceived, that there are two actions in any given case; for example, in the case of the purpose to kill, and the execution of the purpose in actually killing; the one an internal, and the other an external action. If it were so, the man, in the latter case, would be chargeable with a double murder, or two acts of murder. When the action is overt, it is still but one act of the agent. All the difference is, that it now appears in an executive form. Upon this ground it would seem that we always act, except when we are asleep, or are deprived of our reason. Though we do not always act overtly, we do act, by internal voluntary exercises.

II. The next enquiry is—Does man act *freely*? It is necessary to ascertain here, what we mean by acting freely.

If by acting freely, be meant acting independently of the purpose and causal agency of God, which seems to be the thing really intended by at least the most of those who call the moral freedom of man into question, it must be admitted at once, that man does not act freely. There is but one independent being in the universe. God, and God only, is independent. The whole universe besides, proceeding from his powerful word, is, and necessarily must be, in a state of absolute dependence on him. Every angel, devil, man, and worm, every atom, and every modification of atoms, every mind, and every modification of mind, must be in a state of dependence on him. Man is a creature, and therefore, in all respects, and at every moment dependent. If man must be independent of God in any point of view in order to his acting freely, then the simple fact, that he is a creature, presents him as a passive machine, and proves it impossible that he should have any moral relations to God, or to his fellow men. Upon the principle that dependence is inconsistent with freedom of action, more or less, it was impossible that God should create and keep in existence, moral and free agents; that he should have any creatures whatever, to whom he could give

law, and whom he could rule by a moral government. And as moral agents are the only sort of creatures capable of an amiable moral character, of a social moral intercourse, and of real valuable enjoyment, it was impossible that he should gratify his infinite benevolence in the production and sustentation of a system agreeing in its nature with that benevolence.

By acting freely, is it meant that man, by some imagined self-determining power, must be the efficient cause of his own actions? This involves the palpable absurdity, that a man must act in order that he may begin to act. This self-contradictory hypothesis, the first President Edwards, in his treatise on the will, has so fully exposed, that one would think it never can again be resorted to, as entitled to any serious consideration.

By acting freely is it meant that men must act without a governing motive, or in a state of entire mental indifference, or without preferring one thing to another? This is also impossible. For action and indifference are opposites.

What then can, in reason, be meant by acting freely? There is something intended by these terms, which properly belong to the subject. It is important to ascertain with precision, what this something is, that the subject may not be embarrassed by words without meaning, and actions wholly imaginary.

Let it then be observed, that the words *free, freely* and *freedom*, have a correlate signification, and that they have properly a negative import, or are a denial of an involuntary, compulsory restraint. This account of the matter has the authority of that most acute metaphysician the late Dr. Edwards, who is thought to have discussed this subject with more accuracy than any preceding writer. Freedom is the opposite of natural force, of being confined by some extraneous agency to a state from which we would break loose if we could. The slave is not free with respect to the coercion of his master's holding him in bondage. He is restrained forcibly from going abroad whither he will, and is constrained to do things to which he is averse. The master may not be free with respect to some other man, who may, by an equal exercise of power, constrain him.

"How sayest thou," said the Jews to Jesus, "Ye shall be made free? We were never in bondage to any man!" Freedom and bondage are opposites. Freedom in man then with respect to his actions can have respect to nothing but some internal coercive hindrance to which the will is opposed. If man does just what he chooses to do, he is free. If he is under no internal restraint to obstruct the accomplishment of his desires, he enjoys freedom, whether he uses his freedom or not. If

he is under a good law, that cannot abridge his freedom whether he obeys or transgresses that law.—For freedom is not licentiousness; and he ought to do what a good law requires. It is true that a man may, or may not be free with respect to gratifying his wishes, or carrying his purposes into effect. And his freedom or want of freedom corresponds exactly with what we mean by natural ability and inability, power and the want of power. A man is in prison.—The doors of his prison are locked upon him. In this case he is not free to go out, or has not power to go out. Suppose the doors of his prison are opened before him, and he has full permission from the authority which put him there to leave the prison. In this case he is free, or has power to go out. Nothing else can be meant by acting freely, but acting in complete exemption from all such compulsory constraint or hindrance.—It is presumed that we can have no conception of any other freedom which can possibly be predicated of an intelligent being.

Now, though from this simple statement of the inquiry, it may seem to most readers obvious enough that man acts freely, yet it may be useful to make some remarks, farther to illustrate the subject, and to prove the truth of the position, that he does so.

I. It may be observed that it is essential to the nature of all such actions as are attributable to men who act always with intelligence

and by motive, that they are freely done. Action and the freedom of action are, in the nature of things, inseparable, or the one always and necessarily involves the other. With respect to action as it is merely internal, within the man, it is obvious that it is impossible that he should be subject to any involuntary constraint. The supposition of such a constraint is a self-contradiction. With respect to action executively considered, or as it is overt, proceeding to the accomplishment of the purpose that has been formed within, he certainly acts freely. By the supposition that he actually proceeds to execute his purpose, he is subject to no involuntary restraint.

If he is hindered from doing what he would do, did not this hindrance exist, in such a case, and so far, he does not act. Action always ends where involuntary hindrance begins. The one is directly inconsistent with the other. The bare consideration of action in an intelligent creature then, proves that whenever, and so far as he really acts, he acts freely. You cannot get the idea of the opposite from such a bare inspection of its nature. You may deduce it as an inference from a doctrine or argument—but this is reasoning. It may be correct or incorrect. If the inference be justly drawn it will certainly overthrow the doctrine or argument. For no doctrine can be true, no argument can hold, which is subversive of the reality and the freedom of hu-

man action. No doctrine, nor manner of arguing can hold against an unquestionable fact. If the inference be unjustly drawn it will disprove neither the doctrine on the one hand, nor the fact, on the other.

II. We have the evidence which arises from our own consciousness that we act freely. By saying that we are conscious that we always act freely, I rather mean, that we are not conscious of any thing within us or without us, which is the least abridgement of our freedom. We are not conscious of any constraint or force acting compulsorily within, or controlling us without, so far as we act. We are conscious that when we are outwardly constrained, as we sometimes are, so far we do not act. We are moved involuntarily, and therefore passively, forward and backward, this way and that, by an extraneous power, which belongs not to us, but to some other being. Such consciousness is proof strong and incontrovertible that we act freely. We must always remember that whether we act virtuously or viciously, benevolently or maliciously, are depraved or holy, makes, in this case, no difference. For the question of our liberty of action depends not in the least upon the moral quality of our actions.

III. We inevitably treat each other as acting freely. The man who has gone the farthest, either in the notion of chance, on the one hand, or fatalism on the other ;

he who even denies the being of God, and the accountability of man, proceeds, and must proceed, in all the intercourse of life, upon the principle that men act freely. Let him try to put the opposite principle into practice. Let those who would remove accountability from man, in the pretence that he acts mechanically, and not freely, try what their doctrine will do in the intercourse of life. Let them try to treat their fellow-men as so many statues. Let them go on to reason with them as such, and they will appear ridiculous enough.— Let them cease forever to require, to approve and condemn, to remonstrate and to persuade ; let them treat those who slander and defraud, insult and abuse them, who rob and destroy wherever they go, as mere mechanical things, entirely without moral freedom, and therefore no more in fault than the winds and the waves ; as incapable, from the mere passivity of their natures, of law and government. They cannot do it. They are under a necessity of contradicting their principles in their own practice. This necessity, arising from the known and certain constitution of things, of our treating each other as acting freely proves that we do so.

IV. A conclusive proof on this subject to those who admit the divine authority of the Bible, is, that the Bible proceeds from beginning to end, in all its instructions, precepts, threats and promises, its

distinctions of character, its approving and condemnatory sentences, upon this principle. Go through the Bible, and not a passage or a fact will be found but proclaims this as the determination of infallible wisdom. All the remonstrances and injunctions of God towards the people of Israel, all his providential dealings with them for their sins, of which the Bible gives us a history, the appearance and doctrines of Christ, his manner of treating his disciples and the world, his atonement and the whole work of redemption, the system of discipline to which he subjects his own people, and the entire process and issue of the last judgment, as set before us by Christ and his Apostles, proceed undeniably upon this principle as no more to be questioned than our existence. It were vain to quote particular passages. It is plain that this principle is acted upon in God's treatment of mankind as fully as it is acted upon by men with respect to each other ; by masters towards their servants, by parents towards their children, and by princes towards their subjects.

V. It does not seem possible to vindicate the rectitude of the providence of God in the denial of this principle. Innumerable calamities do in fact rest upon mankind. These calamities are so many, so frequent, and often so severe, as apparently to justify the scriptural and common remark, that "man is born unto trouble even as the

sparks fly upwards." No man who is not an atheist will doubt that these calamities take place under the hand of God. "There is no evil in the city but the Lord hath done it." God in his word assigns to us the reason. The reason is entirely governmental. It is because man is a sinner. "Death hath passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." This explanation is the only one that can be given, and it is perfectly satisfactory. Remove this reason, and an awful cloud of the thickest darkness is over the whole of divine providence, God afflicts and destroys without reason. There is no medium, therefore, between a virtual atheism, and the acknowledgement that man acts freely.

I think it important to observe here, that if man is a free agent in any measure, he is so perfectly. No reservations are to be made. For, however it may be with respect to man towards his fellow-man, that he may be partly free and partly bond, nothing of this kind can exist with respect to man as a subject of God's moral government. He cannot be, in his actions, partly bond and partly free. For there is no medium between perfect freedom of action and mechanical instrumentality.—Every proof that has been produced to shew that man is a free agent, and not a mere mechanical instrument, determines that he acts, not with partial and imperfect, but with full and perfect freedom. It is very clear that

God treats man in this light, in all the instructions of his word and in all the measures of his government.

To remove all pretence of the opposite, I judge it is important to remark farther, that man acts as freely as he could act, if he were as holy and as high in rank as an angel; as if he had an enlargement of his natural powers an hundred fold; even as if he were perfectly independent of his Creator, as he is, in this respect, of his fellow creatures. We cannot conceive how the angels of heaven can act more freely than man does. Nor can we conceive how God himself can act more freely.

And, with respect to any other hypothesis that was ever suggested, or can be imagined, we do not perceive how it could secure freedom of action any more than man enjoys in a state of entire dependence. Take the ground of atheism, and any species of atheism. Suppose man to act from a blind invincible fatality, or the opposite, by chance, that is, without any antecedent reason or cause, within or without himself of acting as he does, do we gain any thing by either of these suppositions? Can we conceive of him as doing more than we have considered him as doing, than as acting from some motive, with entire voluntariness, and without any involuntary constraint? Take the ground of the Arminian, who denies the purpose and governmental agency of God, with respect

to human action; and asserts, and endeavors to maintain, that man has a self-determining power, in the exercise of which he previously determines, and is properly the cause, of his own actions. Be it so, suppose him to be possessed of such a self-determining power, what is the exercise of this power determining a following action, but itself acting in view of a motive, with perfect voluntariness, and in an exemption from all external involuntary restraint? And what is this following action thus determined? Is it any thing more?—No. Then nothing is or can be gained by any hypothesis different from that of man's entire dependence on his Creator.

III. In all this freedom of action men are *moral* agents, or they act *morally*. Their actions go to form a moral character. The reason of it is, that man is capable of perceiving clearly the essential and immutable difference which there is between right and wrong, morally considered; between the right of benevolence, and the wrong of malevolence, as exercised and expressed towards God and his creatures; and that he is under the law of God, his moral governor, which requires the one and forbids the other, and can understand and feel his obligation according to this law.—These necessarily imply each other. Moral action necessarily implies a rule according to which it is to be estimated, as right or wrong. And obligation supposes

that this rule is a law authoritatively imposed, which acts upon the conscience and binds the agent. In this, man is eminently distinguished from the lower animals, to which therefore we never impute moral right or wrong. They think, and feel, and choose, and produce effects, some of which are favorable, and some disastrous. But they have no knowledge of God, of a moral government exercised by him, of right and wrong as forming moral character, and constituting moral desert. They therefore never do, in fact, and never can, choose moral good as such, or moral evil as such. They are not accountable; they are not to be reasoned with as capable of being influenced by moral motives. So we inevitably treat them, and so God treats them. He has not placed them under law, or made them accountable. They are governed by their instincts and their appetites. Man God has placed under law. This law is the rule of his duty and of his accountability. The instructions of the scripture place this beyond all controversy. But it is made evident also by facts, and by the necessity of the case. We inevitably treat each other as acting morally. We cannot exist in a state of society upon an opposite principle. A law cannot be in force but upon this ground. For an enactment cannot exist with the force of a law without a penalty expressing and securing the authority of the lawgiver. The pen-

alty implies and enforces obligation. And submitting to this obligation, or resisting it necessarily forms moral character and moral desert. No contract can be entered into, and become binding between individuals for business or for any other purpose; I cannot even enter into your door, as a neighbor, by your consent, but upon the ground that you are a moral agent, and are obliged to that which is morally right, and to abstain from that which is morally wrong. By bidding me to enter in the manner of a friend, you voluntarily assume moral obligation and responsibility. You tacitly, but unequivocally confirm that most equitable and necessary law of God, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

In short, it is an unalterable law of our nature that we should *act*, that we should act *freely*, and that we should act *morally*. We can no more escape forming a moral character and being subjects of moral desert, than we can escape from our shadow or cease thinking. And it is presumed that the opposite would never be seriously entertained, if it were not sought for as a refuge from guilt, and an instrument of opposition to unwelcome truth.

EVERY PERSON'S SALVATION OR DESTRUCTION DEPENDS ON HIS OWN WILL.

In order to understand the subject of this communication, it is necessary to explain what is meant

by the assertion, that it depends upon a person's own will, whether he shall be saved or lost. This means, in general, that it depends upon every one's *choice*, whether he shall be saved or lost. If a person chooses the water of life, he shall have it; or if he refuses the water of life he shall not have it. Or, to drop the metaphor, if he chooses to be saved in the way, which God has devised and revealed in the gospel, he shall be saved. But if he refuses to be saved in that way, he shall be finally lost. God has established an infallible connection between every person's choice in this life, and his everlasting state in the next; or he has made the choice of his heart the condition, upon which he shall be forever happy or miserable. If he chooses the holiness and happiness of heaven, he shall be admitted to the enjoyments of heaven forever. But if he refuses those glorious objects, he shall be excluded from heaven, and be consigned to a state of endless sin and woe.— And since God has established and revealed this constitution between the choice of the heart and the future state of the soul, it may be truly said, that it depends entirely upon every person's choice, whether he shall be saved or lost. His choice is the condition, upon which his eternal state absolutely turns. When any thing is freely offered to any man's choice, it may be truly said, that it solely depends upon his choice, whether he shall

have it or not. When a cup of cold water is offered to a thirsty man's choice, it depends upon his choice, whether he shall or shall not have it. When a bribe is offered to the choice of a judge, it depends upon his choice, whether he will open or shake his hand; or, whether he will receive or reject the bribe. When a reward is offered to one, who has done a meritorious action, it depends upon his choice, whether he shall or shall not possess that token of gratitude. But there is an instance in scripture more pertinent, than any that have been mentioned. Solomon told Shimei, that if he chose to stay in the city, he should live; but if he chose to go out of it, he should surely die. In that case, it depended entirely upon Shimei's choice, whether he should live or die. Precisely in the same sense, it depends upon every person's choice, whether he shall be saved or lost. There is not within any person, nor without him any thing, that can possibly prevent his salvation, if he chooses to be saved. Nor is there within any person, nor without him any thing, that can prevent his final destruction, if he finally refuses to be saved. This is what is meant by the assertion, that it depends upon every person's choice, whether he shall be saved or lost.

I now propose to illustrate the truth of this assertion. And we must be convinced, that it does absolutely depend upon every one's will, whether he shall be

saved or lost, if we seriously and impartially consider the following observations.

1. That every person has power to accept or reject the offers of the gospel. Whoever has power to choose or refuse any thing has power to choose or refuse salvation. But we all know that we have power to choose natural good and evil. This power does not consist in a faculty or principle of will, but in a capacity of loving and hating, or choosing and refusing. This capacity entirely consists in the natural faculties of the mind. Not one of these singly, but all unitedly give us the capacity of choosing and refusing. Perception, memory, reason and conscience are the natural faculties of the mind, which constitute us capable of moral exercises. If we were destitute of all these faculties, we could not exercise any affections or volitions. Or if we were destitute of any one of these natural faculties, we could not exercise any affections of a moral nature, or such as are worthy of praise or blame. But since we possess all these faculties, we are completely able to exercise voluntary affections, which are virtuous or vicious. We can love what is lovely, or hate what is hateful. We can love what is hateful, or hate what is lovely. Our perception enables us to perceive the existence of objects. Our memory enables us to retain the knowledge of what we perceive. Our reason enables us to discover the nature,

tendency and connections of objects. And our conscience enables us to discern the moral quality of objects; or to distinguish between right and wrong. And when we perceive the existence, discover the nature, and distinguish the moral quality of any object, we then have the power of choosing or refusing, loving or hating that object. And our choice, our love, or hatred of that object, will be a moral exercise, and either praise or blame-worthy. Thus every person has the power of choosing or refusing salvation. And since God has established an infallible connection between every man's choice and his future state, it must be true, that it depends upon his will or choice, whether he shall enjoy the blessedness of heaven, or suffer the pains of the damned. It is true, indeed, if all men had not the power of choosing or refusing salvation, it could not depend upon their will, whether they should be saved or lost.— This is plainly the case of all creatures, which are inferior to mankind and which have not the power of choosing and refusing moral objects. God cannot, to speak with reverence, make them probationers for eternity, or suspend their happiness or misery in a future state upon their choice in time. But since men are wiser than the beasts of the field and the fowls of heaven, God may place them in a state of probation in this life for their future and eternal condition. And now it not only

may, but must depend upon their own will, whether they shall be happy or miserable forever—for,

2. God freely offers salvation to all under the gospel with an opportunity to accept it. The Bible abounds with invitations to all, without exception, to accept of pardoning mercy. The evangelical Prophet cries, 'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy on him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.' Yea, he calls and invites all, with great tenderness and compassion, to accept of all spiritual blessings. 'Ho, every one, that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat, yea come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.—Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread, and your labor for that which satisfieth not? Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear and come unto me: hear and your soul shall live.' The Lord Jesus Christ in the course of his preaching abundantly called upon sinners in the most melting language to accept of salvation. He said, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Again it is written—"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried saying, If any thirst, let him come unto me

and drink." He spake several parables to represent the grace of God in his offers of salvation.—He said, "a certain man made a great supper and bade many: and he sent his servant at suppertime to say to them, that were bidden, Come; for all things are now ready." This parable needs no comment. It strikingly illustrates the freeness of the offers, which God makes to sinners in the gospel.—And since Christ has left the world, he invites all to come and receive spiritual blessings from him.—"Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice, and open the door I will come in to him and will sup with him and he with me." Again, he says, "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." All the time such invitations are made to every person, it must be true, that every person may be saved, if he will. His salvation is entirely suspended upon his own choice. If this were not true, there could be no sincerity in these offers of salvation. It is always absurd to propose any thing to any person, upon impossible or impracticable conditions. If there were any thing to prevent men's choosing or refusing salvation, all the invitations in the gospel would be absolutely absurd and inconsistent with the holy and benevolent character of the Deity. Every invitation to sinners in the gospel carries in it conclusive evidence, that it depends upon their choice, whether they shall accept or re-

ject the offer; and of course whether they shall be saved or lost.

3. God commands as well as invites men to accept salvation, which supposes, that it depends upon their will, whether they shall be finally happy or miserable in a future state. Indeed, all the invitations which God gives to men are clothed with authority; but positive injunctions are frequently added to invitations. Thus Moses, in the name of God, not only sets his invitations, but his commands before his people. "See I have set before you this day life and good, and death and evil."—He adds, "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Agreeably to this, Joshua called upon Israel in the name of God, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."—Isaiah held the same language to the same people. "Wash ye, make ye clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well." And Ezekiel was commanded to say, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die." John, the forerunner of Christ, commanded men to receive the glad tidings of salvation. "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of

Judea and saying, repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Christ preached in the same manner. "Now after John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand; Repent ye and believe the gospel." And Paul, agreeably to his commission from Christ to preach the gospel, expressly said, "God now commandeth all men every where to repent." These commands to embrace the gospel plainly imply, that it depends upon every person's will, whether he shall receive or reject the offers of life, or whether he shall be saved or lost. For it would be altogether unjust for God to command any person to do any thing, which did not depend on his will, or which he could not do, if he would. All the commands in the Bible, requiring men to repent, believe, or embrace the gospel, demonstrate, that it does depend upon their choice, whether they shall be saved or lost. Besides,

4. This is further evident from the threatenings of the gospel.—The gospel not only invites and commands, but also threatens.—Our Savior preached the threatenings of the gospel as plainly as its invitations and precepts. He said to the Jews, "Except ye believe, that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Again he said to his hearers, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." In his last commission to his apostles and

their successors, he said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." These are heavy threatenings; and they are denounced against all, who will not come to Christ, that they may have life; who will not accept the offers of the gospel; who will not obey the commands of God; and who reject the counsel of God against themselves. But there would be no justice, nor propriety in these threatenings, if it did not entirely depend upon every one's will, whether he would embrace or reject the offers of eternal salvation. In a word, all the invitations, promises, commands and threatenings of the gospel are founded upon this truth, that it depends absolutely upon every person's will or choice, whether he shall choose life and live, or choose death and die.

This subject suggests one or two remarks.

1. There is a perfect propriety in preaching the gospel to sinners. Though they are opposed to the gospel and therefore it is often thought that it is useless and unsafe to preach the gospel fully and clearly to sinners; yet such preaching is the proper and appointed means for removing their opposition. And it has had this great and happy effect upon all the immense multitude, who have ever believed the gospel and been saved since the fall of Adam. To

preach the gospel fully and clearly to sinners is the proper and special duty of preachers. And by such preaching sinners are treated as rational, accountable and moral agents, and according to their exceedingly affecting and critical situation in this state of trial.—The more fully and clearly the gospel is preached, the more easily and plainly will sinners see that it is a message of life and of death from God to themselves, and the more powerful and pungent will be the motives to accept the offer of life. It is not *preaching*, but it is *the gospel, truly, fully and plainly preached*, that sinners must accept, or perish. And this truth sinners as well as saints will see and feel, if preachers will renounce the hidden things of dishonesty and not shun to declare the whole counsel of God.

2. It is impossible for sinners to find any good excuse for neglecting and rejecting the salvation of the gospel. They can find no excuse in God; his character, his decrees, or his agency; nor in his law or gospel, nor in heaven nor in hell; nor in the world, its cares or labors, its temptations or delusions; nor in their fellow-creatures nor in themselves. Every sinner to whom the gospel is sent, has power to accept it, has the most favorable opportunity to accept it; and is bound to accept it by bonds, which neither he nor any other being can ever break. And such sinners, as hear and reject

the gospel, will meet an aggravated condemnation to the endless pains and torments of hell.

JOHN.

THE SELF DENIAL OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

The will of the Lord Jesus Christ, while he was on earth, was in perfect subjection to the will of his Father. He subjected his own will to the will of God, and wholly and cheerfully submitted himself into his hands. He therefore, possessed a spirit of perfect self-denial. This self-denial essentially consisted in his submitting his will to the will of his Father; or in giving up his interest, personally considered, for the glory of God and the interests of his kingdom. Christ had a valuable interest, which he had a right to regard according to its importance, simply considered; and which, so considered, he did properly regard. But he was willing to submit his own interest to a greater and better interest, which was his Father's interest, or the greatest interest of the universe. Accordingly the Apostle gives this account of the self-denial of Jesus Christ. He says, "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye, through his poverty, might be rich." Again he says, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but

made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." In his Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apostle exhorts christians to look unto Jesus, "who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame." This joy was the glory of God in the salvation of sinners, and the highest good of the intellectual system.—He preferred the great interest of the universe to his own; and for the sake of it gave up his own interest. This was submitting his own will to the will of his Father, who, in his eternal counsel, had determined to promote the highest good of the universe, through the incarnation, sufferings and death of the Son of his love.—With this determination Christ was well pleased, because he placed his own good in the good of others. He loved the glory of God and the interest of his moral kingdom more than his own personal happiness, which made him willing to give up a less, for a more important interest. His regard to his own personal interest may be considered *his will*, in distinction from his Father's will, which regarded the great interest of the universe. And his not seeking his own interest, may be considered his not seeking his own will; and his seeking the interest of his Father may be considered as his seek-

ing his Father's will. His will was his Father's interest; and his seeking his Father's will instead of his own, was his seeking his Father's interest instead of his own. Christ saw that his Father had proposed the most important and glorious object, which could not be obtained, unless he made a sacrifice of himself, and gave up his own good for the good of the universe, which his Father was seeking and was engaged and determined to accomplish.

Now, we ought to bear it on our minds, that Christ's self-denial consisted in thus giving up his own real, valuable good, which, simply considered, he ought to regard. This is an idea of self-denial, that is very different from what is often believed and maintained. Some suppose, that self-denial consists in giving up a less personal good for a greater personal good. But this was not Christ's self-denial. Others suppose, that self-denial consists merely in giving up a selfish good for a benevolent good. But this was not Christ's self-denial. He never had any selfish good to give up. He had a personal good, but not a selfish one. For he never felt any selfish motives towards himself. Again, others suppose, that self-denial consists in giving up sinful affections for holy affections. But this was not Christ's self-denial. For he never had any sinful affections towards any object or being in the universe. It was not possible, therefore, that his self-denial should

consist in any thing else than his loving God supremely, and regarding his glory and interest above his own.

Let us now consider how Jesus Christ expressed and manifested such a spirit of self-denial. This was his governing principle of action. And therefore he must have always expressed it in a plain and striking manner. But he expressed it, especially, in the following instances of his conduct.

1. In his consenting to the glorious scheme of man's redemption. He was concerned in forming that great and complicated and astonishing design. He knew every other possible method of God's displaying himself to the view of his intelligent creatures, and of promoting his glory and their good. He knew, that God might have made all his intelligent creatures perfectly holy, and have preserved them in that state forever, which would have precluded all occasion for his undertaking the office of a Mediator.— But he saw that this would not be the wisest and most benevolent method of God's treating the moral creation. He saw that there was a better way for God to lay open his heart and display his glory before angels and men. And he saw that this best way would render it necessary for him to take the most arduous, difficult and painful part in the accomplishment of the important scheme. And when he saw it, he cheerfully consented to the adoption of a scheme, that

would subject him to the greatest labors and sufferings. Hear his language on this subject before he came into the world. "The Lord God possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting from the beginning, or ever the earth was. Then I was by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in the habitable part of the earth; and my delights were with the sons of men." He covenanted with the Father, in the early days of eternity, to undertake the self-denying work of man's redemption, with a clear and full view of what he must do and suffer in order to accomplish it. Nor did he ever lose sight of his sufferings a single moment, until the very scene opened before him. "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say?—Father, save me from this hour?—but for this cause came I unto this hour.—Father, glorify thy name." It was self-denying to view such a scene of self-denial. And this self-denial he felt and expressed in consenting to go through it. This was the first expression of Christ's self-denial.—And if we consider that he viewed things future as clearly as things present, it must appear to have been an astonishing act of self-denial, and virtually comprehended all the self-denial he ever felt and expressed. It was one eternal act and expression of his self-denying spirit.

2. Christ exercised and display-

ed his self-denying spirit by taking upon him human nature. He was co-equal with the Father in every divine perfection. And while he sustained the character of Mediator in heaven he enjoyed the adoration and praises of the heavenly hosts. When he came from heaven and entered into our world, the Father enjoined it upon the angels to pay him divine homage. "When he bringeth the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." It was, therefore, a superlative expression of self-denial in such a great and glorious and divine person to leave the world of glory, to descend to our sinful world and here unite his divinity with humanity. It would have been an act of self-denial in one of the lowest angels of light to take the fashion of a man and the form of a servant. But it was an infinitely greater act of self-denial for the Lord of glory, the creator of the world and the proprietor of the universe to become united with human nature in its lowest—most contemptible form. It was a great and desirable good, which Christ had a right to desire and regard, to appear in the form of God and all the majesty of his divine nature. But though he was infinitely rich in divine glory, yet he made himself of no reputation, by taking upon him the nature, the form and the condition of a poor and despised man. This marvelous act of self-denial he performed with a high degree of pleasure and satisfaction. Hence

he is represented to address his Father, respecting his incarnation, in terms the most submissive, self denying and joyful. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened; burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me; I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart." This was a strong and striking expression of the most perfect self renunciation and consecration of his glory to the glory of God and the good of the universe.

3. Christ manifested his self-denial, after he became man, by his constant and cheerful obedience to the will of his Father. He publicly and repeatedly declared, that he always meant to be obedient to every intimation of the divine will. He said, "I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father, that sent me. I came from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.—My meat is to do the will of him that sent me and to finish his work." If we now look into his conduct, through the course of his life, we shall find these declarations fully verified by the most constant obedience to every divine precept. He was entirely submissive to his parents, while he was in a state of minority. He read the Bible in his youth and made it the rule of his faith and practice. He lived in a course of secret prayer. Being in the form

of a servant, he labored with his hands, agreeably to the fourth command. And agreeably to the same command, he remembered and sanctified the Sabbath day.—He annually attended the passover, and punctually observed all the Mosaic rites and ceremonies.—He submitted to be baptized by John, in Jordan, as the original rite of inauguration into the priest's office. He preached the gospel with great zeal and diligence.—He went about doing good, curing diseases of body and mind. He submitted to hunger and thirst, weariness, poverty and reproach. As a man, he was obedient to the laws of man; as a Jew he was obedient to the laws of the Jews; and as a Mediator, he was obedient to every mediatorial command, even that of laying down and taking up his life. Now all these acts of obedience were acts of self denial. He was Lord of the Sabbath; he was Lord of the world; yea, he was Lord of the universe; and he had a right to command the service and obedience of the whole intelligent creation. But, nevertheless, he bowed his head and heart to the command of God and man. In this conduct he verified what he declared, that he came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. We cannot find, nor even conceive of any other obedience, so self denying as the obedience of Christ. And this self-denial was uniform, constant and perfect; because he fulfilled all righteousness and obeyed eve-

ry injunction, which his Father laid upon him. This perfect obedience demonstrated, that he sought not his own will, but the will of him, that sent him. But,

4. There was another way, in which Christ more literally and emphatically expressed his self denying spirit; and that was by his sufferings. Though while he lived in retirement and obscurity, we have no account of his suffering any peculiar pain, sickness, or affliction, yet as soon as he appeared in public and visibly acted in his mediatorial office, he drew the hatred, opposition and virulence of the ungodly world against him. They, who were esteemed the most respectable and influential in church and state, united in their feelings and exertions to make him a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. They represented him to be a transgressor of the laws of God and man, an enemy to virtue and religion, a friend to publicans and sinners, in league with sathan, the great enemy of all righteousness, and a disturber of the public peace as well as a traitor to his country. Thus the reproaches of them, that reproached God, fell on him without reserve and without restraint.— But they did not stop here. They often attempted to stone him with stones, and once, to push him headlong down a precipice, with a malignant design to dash him to pieces. These dangers, however, he meant to escape, and by his miraculous power did escape, until his

time came to go to Jerusalem and meet those sufferings and that death, which were necessary to make expiation for the sins of the world. He knew the time when and the place where he was to pour out his soul on the cross.— Accordingly he prepared himself to meet his mortal enemies and to resign himself into their cruel hands. They bind him; they beat him; they spit in his face; they try him; they condemn him; they lead him as a malefactor to the place of execution; and there, with real malefactors, nail him to the cross and make his death as painful and excruciating as possible. Thus Christ was cut off, but not for himself. Thus he was destroyed and rejected of men.— Thus he was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities and the chastisement of our peace was upon him.— Thus he bore our sins in his body on a tree. It is probable that Christ suffered more from the treatment he received from the hands of his enemies than any other person could have suffered under the same treatment. If his body were not more susceptible of pain than that of other men; yet his mind was more capable of seeing and feeling the malignity and cruelty of those, who embroiled their hands in his blood. This natural conjecture seems to be confirmed by his sweating as it were great drops of blood in consequence of his internal trouble and distress, on the prospect of his approaching

death. And now we are to consider, that his self-denial bore an exact proportion to his sensibility of pain, both in body and mind.—To make this evident to all the world and to the universe, his agonizing prayer was made and recorded and transmitted to all future ages. After he had entered into the garden, he said, “My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. And he went a little farther and fell on his face and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me : nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt. O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.” Thus Christ himself solemnly declares, that it was nothing but self-denial, which moved him to endure the tremendous sufferings of the cross.

Thus Christ denied himself of every thing, that it was in his power to deny himself. There was nothing which the glory of God and the good of the universe required him to give up, that he did not give up. He gave up more than any ; yea, than all created beings could have given up, had they been disposed to suffer and die as he did. Hence, through his life and in his death, he gave every kind and every degree of evidence, that he was possessed of perfect self-denial. He was willing to give up and did actually give up his good for the good of others. Though his own personal interests were great, yet he

preferred and sought greater interests. Though he had a proper regard to himself, yet he had a greater regard to the universe ; and this regard he expressed in eternity, in his life on earth and in his death on the cross and will continue to express forever.

The subject under our present consideration suggests the following remarks.

1. Since the Lord Jesus Christ exercised self-denial in undertaking and performing the work of a mediator, then God the Father and the Holy Spirit exercised self denial in appointing him to that work. The Father and the Spirit saw what the work would be, and how much Christ must suffer, when they appointed him ; yet they did appoint him to all the humiliation, suffering, sorrow and reproach, which he endured in order to accomplish the work of redemption. But could they have made such an appointment, or have consented to it without self-denial ? They saw and felt all the evil he suffered. They esteemed and loved the good and the glory of which he deprived himself. And they esteemed and loved Christ as themselves.—They, therefore, as certainly exercised self-denial in his appointment to the work of Mediator as he did in undertaking and performing that work. They denied themselves a real great good for the sake of a real and greater good. This denial they exercised in the spirit of disinterested be-

nevolence and genuine self-denial.

2. Since Christ exercised and expressed self-denial in heaven, before he came into the world, we may conclude there always will be self-denial there. The sacred Trinity will always give up a real good in respect to the damned, for the sake of a greater good.— They will give up the everlasting holiness and happiness of fallen angels and lost men for the sake of the most perfect exercise and manifestation of the goodness and glory of God and the highest interests of the universe. They feel the value of their holiness and happiness far more than it can ever be felt by created beings. They feel the evil of their sinfulness and misery far more than it ever can be felt either by holy or unholy creatures. But they also see and feel the full extent of the greatest good of the universe. And for this good they are willing to deny themselves all the holiness and happiness of the non-elect angels and men, and to endure their eternal sinfulness, loathsomeness, misery and torment. As there has been self-denial in heaven from eternity in respect to the death of Christ, so there will be self-denial in heaven forever in respect to the angels and the human beings that perish. This self-denial will be felt and expressed with the keenest and tenderest sensibility by God, angels and saints.

3. If Christ's self-denial consists in giving up a real benevolent

good for a greater real benevolent good; then self-denial never consists in giving up one selfish good for another, or merely in giving up any selfish good for a benevolent one. This many have supposed to be true self-denial. And in support of their opinion they adduce Christ's command to pluck out a right eye, or to cut off a right hand, or right foot. But a right eye, a right hand, or a right foot is a real good and may be justly desired; and may be as really and as greatly desired in the spirit of benevolence as in the spirit of selfishness. Christ does not say a right eye *sin*, a right hand *sin*, or a right foot *sin*; as many unwisely say. But to sever a right eye, or hand, or foot from the body, is to give up a real and desirable good in the spirit of benevolence and self-denial, which consists in giving up any real personal good, that may be justly desired, for the sake of God and his kingdom and people. If self-denial consists in giving up a selfish good for a benevolent one, then no benevolent being can ever exercise self-denial. For benevolent beings have no selfish good to renounce. But the truth is, that none but benevolent beings ever do exercise real self-denial.

4. If it was right in Christ to give up a less good for a greater, then it must always be wrong to be unwilling to do it. It would have been wrong in Christ, if he had been unwilling to give up his personal interest for the general good;

or any other less good for a greater. And it is always wrong in mankind to be unwilling to give up a less good for a greater. It does not alter the case what good is to be given up, whether our own or the good of others; whether natural or spiritual good; whether temporal or eternal good.—Every less good, however great and of whatever nature, is always to be given up for a greater good. And they, who refuse to do so, act selfishly and wickedly.

5. If Christ's selfdenial consisted in his giving up a less good for a greater, then selfdenial is inseparably connected with happiness and naturally connected with the greatest happiness. Christ's selfdenial was inseparably connected with happiness, though his happiness was once interrupted; and it was finally connected with the greatest happiness. This must always be the case. For they, who have the spirit of self-denial, always esteem and enjoy the greater good for which they give up a less good. And the greater good is the highest good of the universe. As every thing under the divine government is made subservient to the highest good of the universe, they who have the spirit of disinterested benevolence and self-denial, possess and enjoy all things. They rejoice always and they rejoice in all things. Their joy is full. In proportion to their capacity and benevolence they are as happy as God, who is most blessed forever. It is giving up a less

good for a greater, that makes God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and angels, and saints most joyful and happy. They are perfectly satisfied with the greater good for which they sacrifice the less good.

6. If Christ has the spirit of self-denial, then when sinners become christians, they have the same spirit. The apostle says—“If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” And again, “If any man be in Christ he is a new creature; old things are passed away; and, behold, all things are become new.” Let a person only change his heart from selfishness to self-denial, and he changes the universe. God and his decrees, and his conduct, and law; Jesus Christ, and all the doctrines, and duties, and blessings of gospel; are new, and good, and lovely, and glorious to a person, who truly turns from himself.—This must be a great change.—For a person, who so changes himself, changes all things in respect to himself—he changes in respect to himself every being, object and event in the universe.

7. Real christians will manifest the spirit of selfdenial. They feel it and they cannot conceal it without the greatest and most shameful hypocrisy.

8. Nothing but their total selfishness, which is perfect sinfulness, ever prevents sinners from loving Christ and embracing the gospel and possessing and enjoying all things.

9. Every person is bound to be a christian on Christ's own terms. No one can be a christian on any other, or lower or easier, or better terms. He says, "Whosoever he be of you, that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple." LUKE.

THE APOSTLE'S CONDEMNATION OF
FALSE TEACHERS.

No. 1.

INTRODUCTION.

"As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

Whether Paul planted the churches in Galatia or not, it is certain, that he preached the gospel among them, and for a time was greatly esteemed. But after he left them, there came along certain Judaizing teachers, who preached contrary to Paul, and led many into great and fundamental errors. Such conduct both in the deceivers and deceived, was very alarming to the apostle, who wrote this epistle, on purpose to convince them of their guilt and danger. He seems to be astonished, that those, who had been taught the pure doctrines of the gospel, should so suddenly renounce the most important truths and imbibe the most destructive errors. He begins his address in this spirited manner; "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him, that called you into the

grace of Christ, unto another gospel; which is not another; but there be some, that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed."—Though the apostle implicitly blames the Galatians for embracing false doctrines, yet he more expressly and severely reprobates their false teachers. But many may be ready to ask, how Paul could with propriety censure either ministers for preaching, or hearers for receiving erroneous sentiments; for no man had been a greater stickler for error and a greater opposer of truth than he had been. Of all men, in the world, therefore, he ought to have been the most catholic towards those, who had lost the path of truth and were groping in the path of error and delusion. This difficulty, I presume, many have felt; and perhaps it has never been entirely removed from their minds. I propose, therefore, to meet this difficulty; and, if possible, to justify the apostle in his condemnation of false teachers. This subject is no less important than difficult. And its importance will, I hope, justify the attempt to place it in a clear light.

No. II.

Paul preached the true Gospel.

That Paul preached the true gospel he abundantly asserted under divine inspiration; because his enemies frequently questioned not only the truth of his doctrines, but also the truth of his divine mission. He was born out of due time. He was the last of all the apostles.—For a long while after the twelve were sent forth to preach the gospel, he remained an open and violent enemy to it. Hence after his conversion and divine call to preach the gospel, many were ready to scruple his sincerity.—This gave him occasion often to assert his apostolic authority and solemnly declare that he preached the pure gospel of Christ.—Knowing that the false teachers in Galatia had called the truth of his mission and of his doctrines in question, he positively asserts the truth of both, in the beginning of his epistle to the Galatians. His first words are, “Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.” And in the eleventh and twelfth verses of the first chapter, he affirms, that he preached the true gospel of Christ. “But I certify you brethren, that the gospel, which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” This gospel, which Paul

received immediately from Christ, he most fully and faithfully preached. In his farewell address to the elders of Ephesus he said, “I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men, for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.” He told the Corinthians that he had not handled the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commended himself to every man’s conscience in the sight of God. Thus it appears that Paul understood and preached the gospel. And by the gospel we are to understand, that scheme of religious sentiments, which is comprised in the purpose of redemption by the divine Redeemer. God from eternity determined to save a certain number of mankind. And in order to effect this object, he determined that mankind should become sinners and need a Savior; that Christ, the second person in the Trinity, should become incarnate, suffer and die to make an atonement for sin; that the Holy Spirit should convince and convert all those, who were ordained to eternal life, and finally conduct them to heaven; and that all things should be so ordered throughout the universe, as eventually to accomplish the great work of redemption.—This is the sum and substance of the gospel, which Christ revealed to Paul, and which he plainly and faithfully preached.

No. III.

The false teachers, whom the apostle condemned, preached another gospel.

If Paul perfectly understood the true gospel, then he perfectly knew whether the false teachers preached the same gospel, which Christ revealed to him, or another scheme of sentiments, which was subversive of the gospel of Christ. And he expressly declares, that they did preach another gospel, or another scheme of sentiments, which was totally inconsistent with the true gospel, that he had preached, and that the Galatians had once believed. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him, that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel." By him, that called them into the grace of Christ, he meant himself, who had been the instrument of their conversion. And he marvels, that they had so soon renounced the gospel, which he had preached to them, to embrace another gospel, or a scheme of religious sentiments directly contrary to that which he had taught them. But he proceeds to say, that the scheme of sentiments, which they had embraced, was not properly another gospel. "Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." This was as much as to say, The gospel, which your false teachers have preached is not worthy of the name of the gospel, but is a scheme of sentiments totally sub-

versive of the true gospel, which I have preached unto you. And though they pretend to preach the gospel, yet they actually mean to pervert the real gospel of Christ. And for this, I condemn them.—Did they only err in respect to some particular non-essential points, I should not censure them so fully and severely; but since they preach an entirely different and false scheme of religion, I solemnly condemn both them and their doctrines. Hear what I say, "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed." I repeat what I say, that I may be fully understood.—I mean to declare, by divine authority, that if I, or any other inspired apostle, should preach any other gospel, or scheme of sentiments, than that I have preached unto you, and you believed, let him be accursed. And I further affirm, by the same authority, that if any other man, who has not been inspired, should preach any other gospel, than the true gospel of Christ, let him also be accursed. I do not pronounce a curse upon every man, who shall embrace and inculcate any religious error; but I do pronounce a curse upon every man, who shall embrace and preach another gospel, or a scheme of religious sentiments,

that is subversive of the gospel of Christ. And to my certain knowledge, the false teachers, who have removed you from the grace of Christ, in which you have been taught, preach another gospel and would pervert the gospel of Christ. And upon this ground, I solemnly say, *let them be accursed*.—It is proposed in the further consideration of this subject in future numbers to show, that the apostle had good reasons to censure and condemn false teachers. APOLLOS.

For the Christian Magazine.

The following statement of his views and feelings, was made to me in his own writing, by the late Dr. S. Winslow, of Foxborough, Mass. It is submitted to the publishing committee of the Christian Magazine for insertion in some number of that work, if it be thought best. T. W.

RELIGIOUS DISTRESS AND RELIEF.

At the age of about eight years, I was, for a considerable time, much concerned about my future state. I saw, as I thought, that I was in the hands of God, and that from the unbounded extent of his view and determination he must have formed determinations for or against me, from which it would be inconsistent with the nature of God to expect any alteration.—And although the Bible commanded something to be done by me, yet as I felt opposed, I did not think I should do it acceptably without God's assistance, which he

never would afford to bring about an event contrary to his previous determination respecting me.—And though I expected to be judged according to my works, yet I believed my works would be so ordered out in the course of Providence as exactly to fit me for that state, to which the divine mind had assigned me. This, from a sense of my heart opposition to God and of course that he was not my friend, filled me with dismay and astonishment, feeling the most pungent regret that ever I had been brought into being. These apprehensions had their revivals and declines upon my mind until I was about eighteen years of age, when I appeared to myself so odious in the sight of God, that he could not do any other with me, as I thought, than make me eternally miserable. I sought his favour with a mixture of enmity and dismay. This frame of mind lasted several months and then subsided. At the age of about twenty-four, without any particular providence or other means to excite my solicitude, my mind by degrees was stirred up with anxious fears about my spiritual interest, which lasted several months, in which time God was pleased to set my sins in order before me, not in a general and complex, but in a single and separate view. In this time I heard of some, who received divine consolation and were brought into the liberty of the gospel, which stirred up my enmity against them and against God,

because I was left; for which I feared his displeasure. At length it seemed to me, that my concern grew less, which alarmed my fears, lest I should become wholly indifferent about the welfare of my soul. This was my great concern for several days, when reading the 13th of Luke at the 24th which is—"Strive to enter in at the straight gate, for many I say unto you will seek to enter in and shall not be able;" and considering that the word *strive* was not so emphatical as it ought to be rendered from the original, which should be *agonize*, I thought I had not perhaps employed every possible means to obtain the favor of God; I therefore resolved to be more importunate at the throne of grace at a proper opportunity. There was at this time a pious person present; with whom I had been conversing.—I again opened the Bible and began to read at the latter part of the 27th Psalm, particularly the last verse, which

is "wait on the Lord; be of good courage; and he shall strengthen thine heart; wait, I say, on the Lord;" with a number of verses in the beginning of the following Psalm, which gave me inexpressible joy and satisfaction, because I viewed it as the word of God, which I then knew I never had done before. And I admired and loved the divine character, as I then beheld it, unconnected with what he might have done for me; for my interest was at the time wholly out of the question. God was the object and myself as a disinterested spectator, beholding and admiring the divine beauty, which seemed to animate and beautify every object around me; the savor of which seemed in some measure to last for a few hours and was gone.—Since which time I have been almost wholly in the dark; without satisfaction in worldly objects, or the company of the godly.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 160.)

PALESTINE MISSION.

First came 10 or 12 armed with swords and matchlocks. Their dress was merely a turban on the head and a piece of cloth tied round the waist. They met our guide and camel drivers, took each other's hands, kissed, and had all the appearance of friends. It was, however, soon found that they wanted money. Our guide told them they must exact nothing from us, because we were Englishmen; for we travel with English

passports, and though we tell our attendants that we are Americans, yet they know no difference between us and Englishmen, having never before seen Americans, or heard of America. The name of Englishmen is so much respected even among Bedouins, that we were not molested. For two hours, however, as we moved along, our attendants were engaged in loud and violent disputes with these and other companies

of Bedouins, who came up after they went away. They extorted a few dollars from the Armenians and Greeks, and at last took an ass from one of the Arabs. Our shekh knew all these freebooters, and it is probably owing to his acquaintance with them, and his faithfulness to us, that they were so easily satisfied, and that we met with so little trouble from them. He says most of the Bedouins are much worse than these, and yet he called these Satans (Shaitan.)

Under a large Sycamore tree we saw women and children threshing barley on the ground with long sticks. Near by was a shepherdess tending a large flock with her crook in her hand, and the skin of a lamb, having the wool on, thrown over her shoulders for a shawl.

Respecting the Southern boundary of Canaan.

It is difficult to ascertain the limit, which divided the ancient Canaan from Egypt. God said to Abraham, Gen. 15: 18, "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." In Josh. 15: 4, it is said, that the border of Judah "went out unto the river of Egypt." The question is, what was meant by the *river of Egypt*.—D'Anville places it, on his map of ancient Egypt, within about 10 miles of Katich (Casiun) and more than 30 from El Arish (Rhinocalura.) We crossed no river, nor any stream of water, however small, between Carro and Gaza, but we passed the beds of several now dry, one in the valley of Zaaka, another called Silgah four hours, and a third two hours, before reaching Gaza. This last is probably the brook Besor, which David passed over with 400 men in pursuit of the Amalekites, who had smitten Ziklag, and whom he found "spread abroad upon all the earth, eating, and drinking, and dancing," where he "smote them." 1 Sam. 30: 16, 17.

Country of the Philistines.

At half past 5, after riding 11 hours and a half, we arrived at Gaza; took two small dirty apartments in a large filthy khan, and put up for the Sabbath thankful that we were not among deserts of sand, or bands of Arab freebooters, so as to be obliged to travel on the Lord's day. Gaza is the city whose

gates Sampson carried away, and where he slew 3000 Philistines at his death.—We had no very good opportunity to judge of the population of the place, but probably the estimation, given by geographers, of 5000, is not far from the truth. Mussulmans never take a census, unless it be an enumeration of the houses in order to tax them. The city stands on a little elevation. The houses are built of stone, but make a very mean appearance. The scenery around is beautiful.

At Gaza they found a number of Greeks, and a Greek priest, to whom they gave 13 copies of the Scriptures, and sold 25. But one present knew the Greek language, and to him they gave a Testament. The priest said that the church had been built twelve centuries. They left Gaza on the forenoon of Monday, April 21st.

We crossed a bridge over the bed of a small river, now dry; and then passed through groves of olives, and fields of grass, wheat, barley, and tobacco. The plains were agreeably diversified by gentle elevations and small valleys. Five hours and a half from Gaza, we saw on our left the village Mijdal, near the ruins of the ancient Askelon, which is now uninhabited. Such at least is the information given us by the Arabs. After riding eight hours and a half, we pitched our tent near the village Esdood which, from its situation, and from the similarity of the name, we presume to be ancient Ashod. It consists of 100 or 150 of what the people call houses, miserable cabins and holes, built of stone, covered with branches of trees, and roots, and these again with earth so that vegetation appears every where on the tops of them. The place is inhabited wholly by Mussulmans.

Tuesday, 22. In three hours and a half after leaving Esdood, we passed Yibua, a village something smaller than Esdood. In riding through this ancient country of the Philistines, we have seen at a distance to the east, a range of high mountains. On the west, a range of small sand hills ran along between us and the sea. The country around us was green and beautiful, and the soil of a good color, which might, no doubt, be made very productive by proper cultivation. At present, howev-

er, the grass, and crops of wheat and barley are of but a small growth. We saw few villages, and those few are small. There are no scattered houses. The population appears not to be great.

Jaffa.

In ten hours and a half ride after leaving Esdood, they arrived at Jaffa; and, word being sent to Mr. Damiani, the English consul, his Dragoman came to procure them admittance into the city. They took lodgings in the consul's house, which stands by the sea-side, and as is supposed, at, or very near the place, where Simon the tanner lived, and the Apostle Peter was lodged. At evening the table was served by a man of Greek origin, who was 100 years old, and had been 80 years a servant in the family of Mr. Damiani and his father.

On the 24th they left Jaffa on mules and asses, and after a ride of four hours, arrived at Rama, or Ramla, the Arimathea of the Scriptures, where they took lodgings for the night in an Armenian convent.

Approach of Jerusalem.

Friday, 25. At half past 5 we set out for Jerusalem, comforted with the hope, that this was the last day of our journey. In about two hours, we saw a Bedouin horseman sitting on the ground a little before us, with his horse feeding by his side. As we advanced he rose, and boldly put himself in front of us all. The Christians, who were with us, and who rode forward, stopped and turned from him, as if he had been a lion.—As soon as Mr. Damiani told him who we were, he let us pass quietly, but tried hard to get something from the rest of the company. He got nothing, however, except a trifle, which the mule drivers gave him, in order to be on good terms with him hereafter. At 8, we crossed a hill, and then entered a valley, which we were half an hour in passing. Soon after this, we came among the mountains. Here we saw, at a distance, a camp of Bedouins.—As soon as they saw us, one of their horse-men rode on swiftly, as if to interrupt our path. He came into the

road before us, halted, and looked at us again, and then rode off. Had we been Rayahs (i. e. Christian subjects of the Grand Signor,) he would not probably have left us without money. For some time our road lay alongside the bed of a brook, in a deep ravine, with mountains of rocks rising up like Pyramids on each side of us. By degrees the ascent became more steep, till we reached the height of these ragged mountains, where we had a good view of the plains between us and Jaffa. It was often with difficulty that our beasts could walk, on account of the badness of the road, and the steepness of the mountains. These mountains are covered with small shrubs, suitable for goats, of which we saw several large flocks. There are no forests, but in the vallies and on the sides of the hills are many olive and fig trees. At a place called Sareen, two or three fierce, armed Bedouins appeared, and began to demand tribute. We rode on very carelessly, bid them good morning, and enquired after their health.—They began to talk loudly, and ordered us to stop, but we rode on, and they did not attempt to stop us by force.—When the native Christians and Jews pass such places, they have no way to get along, but to satisfy the rapacity of these plunderers.

A little past noon they came to a village, which Chateaubriand calls the village of Jeremiah. A little way from it, was a pure stream of water, flowing out of a rock, where they stopped to quench their thirst, and eat some bread and fruit.

Thence we pursued our journey over a road impassable for camels, and very difficult for mules and asses. After crossing a high mountain, we passed through a deep valley, where is a small village called Kaloona. The mountains here are of a peculiar formation. They seem almost as if they were built by the hand of man, and rise gradually, step by step, like Pyramids. Each step, however, is so fastened into the 'Everlasting Hills,' as to show you that it was placed there by the hand of Him, who "existed before the mountains were brought forth." On these steps, which are sometimes three or four rods wide, and sometimes only a few feet, you see soil, which produces shrubs.

and, when cultivated, vines, figs, and olives. The country continued the same till we were within half an hour of Jerusalem, when all at once Mount Olivet and the Holy City opened to our view. Thus it is often with the last hours of the Christian. He is obliged to pass over a rough and wearisome way, where he is continually exposed to the attacks of enemies, till near the close of life—till his feet are about to stand within the gates of the New Jerusalem, and then he is favored with some bright visions of the place he is soon to enter.

Reflections on Mr. Parsons.

As we drew near the city, we remembered how our dear brother Parsons, when wars and rumors of wars obliged him to leave the place, turned back his eyes, as he ascended the hill west of Jerusalem, and wept and said, "If I shall find favor in the eyes of the Lord, he will bring me again, and show me both it, and his habitation."—Alas for us! these words were fulfilled in a much higher sense, than he then anticipated. We cannot for a moment doubt, that he did find favor in the eyes of the Lord; and though he was not permitted to return to the earthly Jerusalem, yet his divine Savior has given him an infinitely higher felicity, even that of seeing and enjoying the bliss of that Eternal city, in which the divine glory dwells.

They enter the Holy City.

With feelings not easily described, about four o'clock, we entered JERUSALEM. The scenes and events of 4,000 years seem to rush upon our minds; events in which Heaven, and Earth, and Hell, had felt the deepest interest. This was the place, selected by the Almighty for his dwelling, and here his glory was rendered visible.—This was the "perfection of beauty," and the "glory of all lands." Here David sat and tuned his harp, and sung the praises of Jehovah. Hither the tribes came up to worship. Here enraptured prophets saw bright visions of the world above, and received messages from on high for guilty man. Here our Lord and Savior came in the form of a servant, and groaned, and wept, and poured out his soul unto death, to redeem us from sin, and save us from the

pains of hell. Here, too, the wrath of an incensed God has been poured out upon his chosen people, and has laid waste his heritage.

Messrs. Fisk and King took lodgings in a Greek convent, called the Convent of St. Michael the Archangel, situated but a little distance from the place where it is supposed the Lord Jesus was crucified. There windows looked out upon the Mount of Olives, from whence he ascended to glory, and where he commanded his disciples to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Mr. Wolff took lodgings with his brethren the Jews.

The first part of their Journal concludes with the following request to their brethren and patrons in this favored land, which will draw forth many prayers in their behalf to Him who heareth prayer, and whose eye, doubtless, hath never been regardless of the interesting land in which they now dwell.

Christian Brethren in America;— Pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified, even as it is with you, and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all men have not faith.

DESCRIPTION OF JERUSALEM,

By Messrs. Fisk and King.

JERUSALEM appears, in a general view, to be situated on the side of a mountain, descending toward the east, where it is divided from Mount Olivet by the valley of Cedron. The summit of the mountain is considerably higher than the city, so that in coming from Jaffa you arrive near Jerusalem before you see it.

On a nearer view of the city, you perceive that it is built on several hills; viz: Zion at the south-west part, Calvary at the north-west, Moriah at the south-east, and Bezetha at the north-east. According to the ancient descrip-

tions of the city, it included another hill called Acra. This hill it is not now easy to distinguish; at least, we see nothing which corresponds entirely to the description of it given by Josephus. There is a hill between Zion and Moriah, which corresponds well to the east part of Acra. Josephus says the valley of the Cheesemongers, which divided Acra from Zion, went out to Siloam. This applies precisely to the hill in question; but Josephus adds that Acra was in the form of a crescent. This does not apply to the hill of which we speak. Possibly, however, this hill may have been anciently connected with what is now the west part of Zion, and separated by a small valley from the city of David. Before Titus besieged Jerusalem, it had been captured five times, and once demolished entirely by the Babylonians. Titus spared the west wall and three towers, "but for all the rest of the wall, it was so thoroughly laid even with the ground, by those that dug it up to the foundation, that there was left nothing to make those that came thither believe that it had ever been inhabited." And since the time of Titus, Jerusalem has been often plundered, and at least partially destroyed. In the space of so many ages, it is to be expected, that some vallies should be filled up, and some hills levelled. It is, also, extremely difficult to trace little ascents and descents in an area covered with buildings of various heights. Whether the west part of what seems now to be Zion, was formerly a part of Acra, or not, it is difficult to decide. The Jews at present call the whole hill Zion.—We shall, therefore, speak of it as such, and give the name Acra to the hill, which lies between Zion and Moriah.

The south wall passes over mount Zion, near its summit, so that a great part of the hill is without the city. South of the hill is the deep valley of the son of Hinnom; the same valley, turning north bounds Zion likewise on the west. The vallies, which separates it in the city from Calvary on the north, and Acra on the north-east, are not deep. Moriah has on the east the deep valley of Cedron. On the south of it, without the city, is a little elevation which is marked on D'Anville's map as Ophel; thence the descent is steep, till you come to the fountain of Siloah.—The vallies north and west of Moriah at present are not very deep. Calvary was perhaps only a small elevation on

a greater hill, which is now the north west part of the city; but the name is now given to the whole hill. Bezetha is separated from Calvary by a wide valley; and east of Calvary is the dividing valley between Moriah and Bezetha, in which is the pool of Bethesda.

We have viewed Jerusalem from different stations, have walked around it and within it, and have stood on the Mount of Olives with Josephus' description of it in our hands, trying to discover the hills and vallies as laid down by him near 1800 years ago; and after all our research we compare Jerusalem to a beautiful person, whom we have not seen for many years, and who has passed through a great variety of changes and misfortune, which have caused the rose on her cheeks to fade, her flesh to consume away, and her skin to become dry and withered, and have covered her face with the wrinkles of age; but who still retains some general features, by which we recognize her as the person, who used to be the delight of the circle in which she moved. Such is the present appearance of this Holy City which was once the "perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth."

Missionary Herald.

(To be continued.)

ORDINATIONS.

On the 28th of April, the Rev. Alexander Phenix was ordained over the second church in Springfield, Mass.—of Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Romeyn, of New-York.

The Rev. Jacob Cummings was recently ordained over the Congregational Church in Stratham, N. H. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Dimmick, of Newburyport, Mass.

The Rev. Dr. Mason, President of Dickinson college, has tendered his resignation to the Board of Trustees, on account of ill-health.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Philotapeinos, Theophilus and W. are received.

ERROR.

In some of the copies, page 177—2d line from the top, insert—"his interest and his Father's will."